

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3—8, and 10—27 remain in this application. Claims 2 and 9 are currently cancelled and claim 28 was previously cancelled. No claims are presently or have previously been withdrawn. Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 17—20, and 24 are currently amended.

*Claims 1—7, 11, 13—15, 17—23, and 25—27 are allowable over McCormick and Howell*

Claims 1—7, 11, 13—15, 17—23, and 25—27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,585,246) (“McCormick”) in view of Howell (U.S. Patent No. 3,481,215) (“Howell”).

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested on two grounds. First, claims 1—7, 11, 13—15, 17—23, and 25—27 require an integral self-locking, double helical gear as part of the drive train. McCormick not only doesn’t teach such a drive train with an integral self-locking feature, it discourages it by specifically teaching starting with a simple, base design that can be modified for robustness or extra features should the need arise. For example, McCormick teaches adding the optional add-on brake shown in FIG. 2 that can be used with the clamp of FIG. 1 when heavier clamp arms are needed. regardless of whether McCormick can be modified, McCormick clearly discourages an all-in-one design by teaching the desirability to start with a stock model (as shown in FIG. 1) for light use that may be modified on an as needed basis as shown in FIG. 2. This allows greater flexibility in implementation of the clamp for varying jobs.

Second, it is respectfully submitted that McCormick and Howell are not analogous to the art of blowout preventer actuation. The claimed subject matter covers a subsea regulating device for the linear regulation of a shut-off element of a subsea well blowout preventer. McCormick is directed to a power clamp for holding objects while Howell is directed to double helical gears. Even further, a power clamp is not analogous to a workpiece machine. McCormick and Howell are clearly in different fields of endeavor that involve different structures for different purposes. Also, McCormick and Howell are not reasonably pertinent to the problem of blowout preventer actuation because a person of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably have been motivated to look for or have expected to solve the problem by considering a reference dealing with an electric clamp.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1—7, 11, 13—15, 17—23, and 25—27 are not obvious over the proposed combination of McCormick and Howell. Allowance of these claims is requested.

*Claims 8, 10, 12, 16, and 24*

The examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick in view of Howell, and further in view of Waber (U.S. Patent No. 6,095,487). The examiner rejected claims 9—10 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick in view of Howell, and further in view of Allen (U.S. Patent No. 5,722,304). The examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick in view of Howell, and further in view of Coppola, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,743,348). The examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormick in view of Howell, and further in view of Gilges, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,370,011).

Claims 8, 10, 12, 16, and 24 all depend either directly or indirectly from allowable claim 1. Claim 9 has been cancelled. For at least these reasons above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8, 10, 12, 16, and 24 are also allowable over the cited references.

**CONCLUSION**

A Notice of Allowance is requested in this case. If the examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, claim limitations may have been referred to in shorthand fashion, or particular claim elements may have been highlighted. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. There may also be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art that have yet to be raised, but that may be raised in the future.

Unless specifically stated that an amendment was made to distinguish the prior art, it was the intent of the amendment to further clarify and better define the claimed invention and the amendment was not for the purpose of patentability. Further, although certain claims may have been amended, pursuit of obtaining the allowance of these claims as originally filed is not abandoned and the right to pursue these claims in a continuing application is reserved without prejudice.

Appl. No. 10/525,926

January 21, 2011

Reply to Final Office Action January 9, 2008

If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Conley Rose, P.C. Deposit Account Number 03-0335 (ref. 1600-11400) of Conley Rose, P.C., Houston, Texas.

Respectfully submitted,  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

/Collin A. Rose/  
Collin A. Rose  
Reg. No. 47,036  
P.O. Box 3267  
Houston, Texas 77253-3267  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)